

# Exhibit 8

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 03/27/2020 11:36 AM

**Technical Review Coversheet**

Applicant: Edgar J Ulloa Lujan (P022A200055-003)

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

	Points Possible	Points Scored
<b>Questions</b>		
<b>Quality of Proposed Project</b>		
<b>Quality of Proposed Project</b>		
1. Proposed Project	60	45
<b>Sub Total</b>	60	45
<b>Qualifications of the Applicant</b>		
<b>Qualifications of the Applicant</b>		
1. Applicant	40	23
<b>Sub Total</b>	40	23
<b>General Comments</b>		
<b>General Comments</b>		
1. General Comments	0	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	0	0
<b>Priority Questions</b>		
<b>Competitive Preference Priority</b>		
<b>Priority Languages</b>		
1. Preference Priority	2	0
<b>Academic Fields</b>		
1. Preference Priority	3	0
<b>Sub Total</b>	5	0
<b>Total</b>	105	68

## Technical Review Form

Panel #6 - East Asia 2 - 1: 84.022A

Reader #2: \*\*\*\*\*

Applicant: Edgar J Ulloa Lujan (P022A200055-003)

### Questions

#### Quality of Proposed Project - Quality of Proposed Project

1. Quality of Proposed Project - The Secretary reviews each application to determine the quality of the research project proposed by the applicant. The Secretary considers:

Reader's Score: 45

#### Sub

1. The statement of the major hypotheses to be tested or questions to be examined and the description and justification of the research methods to be used.

#### Strengths:

The comparative combination of work on the Mexican-US border drug wars and Europe-China opium trade in the late 19th-early 20th century is fascinating and relevant today. The project makes good use of Spanish and English in two different locations.

#### Weaknesses:

The methods for doing the comparison and basis for comparison sometimes seems weak. It also seems like research in China would be ideal to include if possible, though this is a more minor weakness than the other.

Reader's Score: 9

2. The relationship of the research to the literature on the topic and to major theoretical issues in the field, and the project's originality and importance in terms of the concerns of the discipline.

#### Strengths:

The theoretical review is strong.

#### Weaknesses:

The secondary scholarship on the Opium Trade seems somewhat insufficiently presented.

Reader's Score: 8

3. The preliminary research already completed in the United States and overseas or plans for such research prior to going overseas, and the kinds, quality and availability of data for the research in the host country or countries.

Sub

**Strengths:**

The candidate seems very familiar with the resources available and specific archives.

**Weaknesses:**

The contact with the archive is a bit vague and non specific about materials, though it does document access.

**Reader's Score: 8**

4. The justification for overseas field research, and preparations to establish appropriate and sufficient research contacts and affiliations abroad.

**Strengths:**

Some materials do need to be obtained abroad.

**Weaknesses:**

The documentation of access is limited and in some cases the materials would be available digitally.

**Reader's Score: 6**

5. The applicant's plans to share the results of the research in progress and a copy of the dissertation with scholars and officials of the host country or countries.

**Strengths:**

The candidate will share the results with hosts.

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

6. The guidance and supervision of the dissertation advisor or committee at all stages of the project, including guidance in developing the project, understanding research conditions abroad, and acquainting the applicant with research in the field.

**Strengths:**

These plans are laid out.

**Weaknesses:**

This could be clarified further, in terms of timing and the specific contact.

**Reader's Score: 9**

**Qualifications of the Applicant - Qualifications of the Applicant**

1. Qualifications of the Applicant - The Secretary reviews each application to determine the qualifications of the applicant. The Secretary considers:

**Reader's Score: 23**

**Sub**

1. The overall strength of the applicant's graduate academic record.

**Strengths:**

The grades at NYU and Georgetown seem well documented and solid.

**Weaknesses:**

It would be helpful to have a clearer CV that lays out the fields of study and training more clearly.

**Reader's Score: 7**

2. The extent to which the applicant's academic record demonstrates a strength in area studies relevant to the proposed project.

**Strengths:**

Overall coursework in area studies is represented.

**Weaknesses:**

There could be better documentation of undergraduate training in area studies.

**Reader's Score: 6**

3. The applicant's proficiency in one or more of the languages (other than English and the applicant's native language) of the country or countries of research, and the specific measures to be taken to overcome any anticipated language barriers.

**Strengths:**

The candidate has strong Spanish for the research.

**Weaknesses:**

There is incomplete material on the language reference. The candidate also seems to be a heritage speaker of Spanish.

**Reader's Score: 5**

4. The applicant's ability to conduct research in a foreign cultural context, as evidenced by the applicant's references or previous overseas experiences, or both.

**Strengths:**

The candidate has done research in various contexts.

Sub

**Weaknesses:**

None noted.

**Reader's Score: 5**

**General Comments - General Comments**

**1. Please provide general comments.**

**General:**

The idea of doing this comparative research through film seems fascinating. Additional advising on the project narrative would be advisable.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Priority Questions**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Priority Languages**

**1. We award an additional two (2) points to an application if it meets this priority:**

**A research project that focuses on any modern foreign language except French, German, or Spanish.**

**Note: The score will be EITHER TWO (2) OR ZERO (0). Do not enter any other number.**

**General:**

The research is not in a priority language.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Competitive Preference Priority - Academic Fields**

**1. We award an additional three (3) points to an application if it meets this priority:**

**A research project conducted in the field of science, technology, engineering, mathematics, computer science, education (comparative or international), international development, political science, public health, or economics.**

**Note: Applicants that address Competitive Preference Priority 2 must intend to engage in full-time dissertation research abroad in modern foreign languages and area studies with a thematic focus on any one of the academic fields referenced above.**

**Note: The score will be EITHER THREE (3) OR ZERO (0). Do not enter any other number.**

**General:**

The research is not in these areas.

**Reader's Score: 0**

**Status:** Submitted  
**Last Updated:** 03/27/2020 11:36 AM